

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII
LIBRARY

PAPERS OF THE
HAWAIIAN HISTORICAL SOCIETY
NUMBER 19

THE HAWAIIAN KING

(MO-I, ALII-AIMOKU, ALII-KAPU)

By JOHN F. G. STOKES

(Formerly Curator of Polynesian Ethnology and Curator-
in-charge of the Bernice P. Bishop Museum, Honolulu)

Honolulu, Hawaii
Published January, 1932

Hawaiian Historical Society
Papers 1919

THE HAWAIIAN KING*

(MO-I, ALII-AIMOKU, ALII-KAPU)

By JOHN F. G. STOKES

(Formerly Curator of Polynesian Ethnology and Curator-in-charge of the Bernice P. Bishop Museum, Honolulu)

A study of the accounts of ancient and modern systems of Hawaiian government reveals a confusion in terms misleading to many of the non-Hawaiian members of this community. Apparent errors thus arising are being repeated in the official and unofficial text-books of Hawaiian history, and thus perpetuated in the schools. It is the purpose of this paper to discuss some of the terms used for Hawaiian royalty, and the systems represented, and to offer such suggestions on their origins as the Hawaiian information in hand may warrant.

Today in the Hawaiian language the term *moi* (*mo-i*, pronounced in English, "moh-ee") indicates "king", "majesty", "supremacy", etc. Fornander (11, pp. 64-7) applied it in 1880 in particular to the ruler of a whole island through "some constitutional or prescriptive right" regardless of "territorial possessions or power." This opinion was accepted in good faith by Alexander (1, p. 26) in 1891, by myself (35) in 1909, and by Kuykendall (25, p. 370) in 1926.

Fornander (11, pp. 66-7) also regarded the right and the term as introductions into Hawaii consequent upon the migrations of 1100 to 1300 A. D., "employed to distinguish the status and functions" of the island ruler from those "of the other independent chieftains of the various districts of an island—the *Alii-ai-moku*, as they were called." Such conclusions were based on

*This paper was presented in outline at the meeting of the Anthropological Society of Hawaii in November, 1931. Appreciation and thanks are expressed to the Trustees of the Hawaiian Historical Society for its publication.

It is a pleasure to acknowledge assistance and constructive criticism of the paper from Dr. P. H. Buck, Messrs. Bruce Cartwright, K. P. Emory, and W. F. Wilson, from Bishop H. B. Restarick and Rev. H. P. Judd, and especially from R. S. Kuykendall of the History faculty in the University of Hawaii.

the absence of the term from the legends of the earlier periods, and the claim that "the very word itself, if it existed at all in the Hawaiian dialect, was never applied in the sense it afterward acquired. We look in vain through the Hawaiian dialect for any radical sense of the word *Moi*. It has but one concrete meaning, that of sovereign."

Other Polynesian philologists have also wondered about this term *moi*. It seems to belong as little to the rest of Polynesia as Fornander found it unattached to early Hawaii. In view of the fact that it was, and is, generally believed that the migrations mentioned were from southern Polynesia, the appearance of the term only in Hawaii has naturally been the cause of much speculation.

It is unfortunate that Fornander's views on this matter have had such wide acceptance. The present investigation indicates that: (1) The term *moi* was first applied to a Hawaiian sovereign, not about 1300 A. D. but in 1842, when it was used officially as a specific term for "Majesty." Its adoption was due to modern foreign influence. (2) On account of the native unfamiliarity with the new term, it was later applied indiscriminately for "majesty", "sovereign", or "king" and officially displaced the older term *alii* or *'lii*. (3) The term first appeared in print about 1832, in translations of the Scriptures, with particular reference to "The Divine Majesty" and thus may have been a recent introduction or adaptation from another language. (4) However, it may have been a Hawaiian sacerdotal or sacred term, unused in common speech, for the representation of the dominant Hawaiian god. (5) The Hawaiian term for "king" was *alii aimoku*, applied not only to the independent ruler of part of an island, but to the ruler of the whole of an island or of several islands. It pertained to the active or administrative side of Hawaiian royalty. (6) The "constitutional or prescriptive right" sought by Fornander may be found in the passive side of Hawaiian royalty, as the hereditary right of the *alii-kapu* or "divine chief."

It is also indicated by the present study that in Hawaii there were royal customs not found in other parts of Polynesia. Fornander seems to have sensed this fact although he did not state it.

"Moi" not in early histories

Had the term *moi* for "king" come into use by Hawaiians as

early as 1300 A. D., it should have occurred in early writings, particularly those in the Hawaiian language. I cannot find it in the accounts of voyages and travels or in histories published in English up to 1847. For works in Hawaiian by Hawaiians, it is absent from histories written up to 1863. These include (a) the important contribution written in 1840 (28, p. 18) by David Malo (27) who was born in 1793 and lived a quarter century under the old regime, and (b) the extensive collection of native manuscripts made by Fornander (12) probably between 1860 and 1875, and recently published by the Bishop Museum in three large volumes.

The histories in Hawaiian by Dibble (8) in 1838, and the enlarged edition by Pogue (29) in 1858 use *alii* instead of *moi* for "king", as do practically all the other missionaries in their translations. Green (14) in the "Church History" uses *alii* for the Roman Emperor, for the Christ, for modern European monarchs, and for the King of Hawaii.

"Moi" a Scriptural term

In the translations of the scriptures I have so far been able to find the term *moi* only eight times, as shown in the quotations in Table I. They do not confirm Fornander. One translation, by Richards, uses the term as equivalent to "supreme." Seven translations are by Bingham for whom *moi* had the primary sense of "Divine Majesty." For "majesty" the other translators used *nani*, *hanohano*, and *ihiihi*. Richards prefers *nani*, but uses all the synonyms, while Bingham himself employs *hanohano* and *nani*. The translations were published about 1832.

Later, in a manuscript translation of the New Testament, Rowell (32) discarded *moi* in favor of other terms, as shown in Table I.

The term *moi* is carried in Bingham's vocabulary of 1832 as "sovereign" and "supreme", and in Andrews' vocabulary of 1836 as "a sovereign, applied also to Jehovah", and "supreme". Authorities are not given but, later, in Andrews' dictionary of 1865, all the definitions identifying *moi* with "royalty" are dependent upon Biblical references. It might then appear that the term *moi* in this connection was an introduction by the translators, who were responsible for many Hawaiian neologisms required for adequate interpretation. Most of them were drawn

from Greek and Hebrew. However, friends searching these languages for the derivation of *moi* have so far reported against the probability of finding it there.

The possibility of its being derived from a Hawaiian sacerdotal term will be discussed below. For the present, it seems certain that as found in use it was an introduction or adaptation in 1832 for translations of the Bible. We may now follow its official adoption.

Official introduction

When Kamehameha I consolidated the island kingdoms under one head, a new term might have been expected for "the king" if the Hawaiians themselves were neologically inclined. However, Kamehameha I and Kamehameha II apparently were content to remain *Ke Alii*.^{*} Kamehameha III was equally so, but in the latter part of his reign, apparently, it was decided that the dignity of Hawaiian royalty required bolstering up, and the term *Ka Moi* was officially introduced to indicate "His Majesty." This was after Kamehameha III had voluntarily yielded his absolute power and granted a constitutional government. We may definitely establish the date of the change by running through official documents.

In 1841, the constitution, and the laws which followed it, were published (16). In these the term *moi* is not used, and the official title of the king, prescribed for royal address in the second law, is *Alii*, thus: "Na ke Alii nui, na Kamehameha III" (To the king—or to His Majesty—Kamehameha III). The title page carries the name "Kamehameha III" without further dignification. The term for "king" throughout the text is either *Alii* or *Aliinui*, except that it is stated that "Kamehameha I was the head [*poo*] of this kingdom."

In the manuscript proceedings of the legislative council from April 1841 to April 1843, the term used is *Alii* or *Aliinui*, whether applied to Kamehameha III or to foreign sovereigns. The publication (18) of the laws enacted in April 1843 contained many references to *ke aupuni* (the government, or kingdom), but not to "the king." At that time the control of the government was in the hands of a commission.

^{*}Mr. W. F. Wilson has drawn my attention to the inscriptions on the coffins of Kamehameha II and his queen (Byron's *Voyage of the Blonde*, London, 1826). In these *moi* is not mentioned, but "Eli", namely *Alii*, is given three times.

Appearance in 1842

The council met in Lahaina until April 1843. In August of that year, it met in Honolulu. The published title (19) of the new laws then enacted carried the authority of "Ka Moi Kamehameha III, Ke Alii o ko Hawaii nei Pae Aina" (His Majesty Kamehameha III, King of these Hawaiian Islands). Consideration of this and the facts preceding indicate (1) that the term *Moi* was first officially recognized between the years 1841 and 1843, and (2) that it was probably not familiar to the Hawaiians themselves.

Running through the early State correspondence (13) for about ten years prior to August, 1843, letters are to be found addressed to the Hawaiian king by the many resident consuls, captains of war and mercantile vessels, Catholic missionaries, Hawaiians, and many others. Some letters are originally in Hawaiian; others are translated into Hawaiian. In some there is such informality of address as "My dear King". However, a general tendency towards formality is maintained, and "Majesty" is variously rendered. In addition to the usual Hawaiian address to royalty, *E ke Alii*, "O King", there is found *E ka Haku*, "O Lord", *Mea Kiekie*, "Exalted One", or *Mea Hanohano*, "Honored One",—the last apparently gaining in favor. The variation implies that some definite term was sought.

Among the papers mentioned, the term *Moi* indicating "King" is not met with at all; indicating "Majesty" it appears for the first time in the translation, into Hawaiian, of a letter (13a) dated September 1, 1842. The translation is of particular interest because it is in the handwriting of an American, G. P. Judd, appointed on May 15, 1842 as official translator and recorder (1, p. 332 and 16 a, p. 200). Apparently it marks the first official use of the term.

The earliest publication (23 a, p. 54) applying the term to a Hawaiian monarch appears to have been on October 25, 1842, in a vernacular newspaper edited by a missionary. This gives a translation (apparently by the official translator) of a letter from America to the king.

Similar translations were made in two publications in 1843, which give Judd as the translator. In these, the correspondence and speeches relating to the provisional cession of the kingdom

(13 b) and to its restoration (13 c) were given in English and Hawaiian. It is worthy of note that in the earlier of the two, "Majesty" is once rendered *mea Hanohano*, and is twice ignored in the Hawaiian—irregularities which suggest new usages. Obviously the term was newly applied by the official translator about this period.

Possibly the new application began with the translation of the letter of September 1, 1842. The Hawaiian term *alii* was used for "sea-captain" as well as for "king", and a specific term for "majesty" was desirable. *Hanohano*, then coming into vogue, was needed for another purpose in official language. For instance, the letter opens with: "I have the honor to inform your Majesty that . . .", which the translator renders gracefully as "Ua hanohano wau i ka hoike aku ia oe e ka Moi penei . . .". *Moi*, as "sovereign" was already in the vocabulary published in 1836 as a result of missionary labors, and *hanohano*, released from other service, could be used fittingly for "honored."

Not a Hawaiian choice

So far as we have followed the use of the term, it is evident that *Moi*, applied to a Hawaiian monarch, was an introduction into the Hawaiian language by one not of Hawaiian birth. Contrary to Fornander's statement it was not applied to their kings by the Hawaiians, to whom the term *alii*, with its qualifications, conveyed the full idea of royalty. As Jarves explained (see below) the governmental advisers desired to teach the natives foreign court formalities. If we follow the course of *moi* into Hawaiian official language, we will find that the Hawaiians while trying to cling to their own term *alii* for "king", first attempted to use *moi* for "majesty" as newly taught, and then gradually applied it as a synonym for "king"—the way Fornander found it later.

From August 1843 onward the published title pages of the laws carried the phrase "Ka Moi Kamehameha III, ke Alii o ko Hawaii Pae Aina." But it required time to secure acceptance of the new term *moi* by the Hawaiians, except as a matter of extreme formality. For instance, while the record (17) of the legislative proceedings of May 6, 1845, is headed by the statement that they were gathered together at the command of *ka Moi*, the term *ke 'Lii* is used in the body of the report. In addition,

there is spread on the records a letter in which Kamehameha III signs himself as *ke 'Lii*.

New Formalities

Alexander notes (1, p. 255) that on May 20, 1845, "the legislature was formally opened for the first time, by the king in person, with fitting ceremonies." It was a noteworthy occasion, rendered especially significant by the announcement then made of the appointment of ministers of state and the acknowledgment of Hawaiian independence by the great powers of the world.

In the council meetings of May 13, 15 and 19, the preparations for the royal formalities (*ano Alii*) had been discussed, the term used for "king" being *Ke Alii* or *ke 'Lii*. Minister G. P. Judd had charge of the arrangements and on the 15th outlined the plan "of the king's attendance . . . with all his glory [or majesty]" (*o ko ke Alii hele ana . . . me kona nani a pau*, as the native scribe has it.) On the 19th, when the arrangements were being approved, the term used for "king" was still *ke 'Lii*. However, other ideas were stirring: in one place appears the expression "*ke 'Lii Hanohano Kamehameha III*," and in another, "*H. H. M. Kamehameha III, ke 'Lii*", the last being a hybridization for "His Hawaiian Majesty Kamehameha III, the King."

On the great day, May 20, the unusual formality made the native recording clerk nervous over his responsibilities. He opened (18) with the statement: "*Hele mai ke 'Lii*" (The King arrived), and followed in the next paragraph with "*Heluhelu ka Moi Hanohano Kamehameha III i kana Palapala*" (His Glorious Majesty Kamehameha III read his address). The body of the record generally carried the term *alii*, but the addresses prepared beforehand maintained the formality, although there were some irregularities: "*ke 'Lii Lokomaikai loa ia Victoria ka Moi Wahine o Beretania*" (the most Benevolent Sovereign Victoria Female Majesty of Britain). In the following we get the Biblical influence: "*Ke Akua mana loa, ka Moi o na Moi, ka Haku o na Haku*" (the most powerful God, King of Kings, Lord of Lords). The closing address ended with "*Na ke Akua e malama i ka Moi*" (May God preserve the King, or, Your Majesty).

As the legislature continued, new expressions are to be noted, such as "*E oluolu ka Moi*" (May it please your Majesty) and

"Ka Moi, ke Alii" (His Majesty, the King). In the discussions, *Alii* was frequent, but there were valiant attempts to say *Moi*. As the new laws were printed, however, the editor seemed to be careful to use the term *Moi*. An exception is to be noted. In the laws of 1856, every preamble carries the authority of *Ke Alii* instead of the almost familiar *Ka Moi*.

Not used by Judiciary

There were other exceptions. W. L. Lee, who placed the judiciary on its feet (1, p. 258) and later became chief justice, gives (26, iii) as his authority for preparing the Penal Code published in 1850, the following: "Mamuli o ka ke Alii kauoha iloko o kana Aha" (In accordance with the King's commands within his Assembly. Lee may have been guided by a lawyer's precision in language, or possibly he wished to be understood by the bulk of the Hawaiians.

Even as late as 1864, apparently, the term *Ka Moi* had made little progress outside official circles. Kamehameha V, who leaned towards absolutism, promulgated a new constitution, in section 34 of which (20) he explained that "The Moi is the Alii Nui over all the chiefs and people. The kingdom is his." This is approaching Fornander's value of the term. It seems certain that the natives themselves never regarded it as more than a synonym or substitute for their old term for "king." The following translations from Kamehameha V's Constitution will serve for illustration:

Section 41. The *Moi* will appoint . . . who will remain during the pleasure of the *Alii*.

Section 42. The *Alii* will appoint . . . who will remain during the pleasure of the *Moi*.

Foreign influence revealed

Fortunately, Jarves the historian was editor of the government newspaper during the famous opening of the legislature on May 20, 1845, and throws much light on the unusual ceremonies. In half a page of his history (21, p. 197) he explains that "it is the desire of the advisers of the king to prepare for the nation a polity of forms" compatible with those of "official order and etiquette as they exist in more advanced countries." "Thus many forms and ideas are introduced, which although

in the outset appear disjointed and crude, yet by practice conduce to useful results." Jarves does not specifically mention any new term, but there is little question that *Moi* for "Majesty" was thrust into official use at this time together with the other new formalities. The advisers referred to were of foreign birth (1, p. 332).

If to the preceding I may add current observations, I will state that the older Hawaiians still use the term *Ke Alii* instead of *Ka Moi* in reference to the king. Most of them are of the opinion that *moi* is modern. I am strongly guided by the view of the historical authority Mrs. Lahilahi Webb (38), who regards the word as foreign, because of its unusual pronunciation.

In this review, we have found that the term *moi* for "king" or "majesty" was not in use by historical writers of Hawaiian blood, writing as late as 1863, nor is it in general use among the older people today. In other words, it did not belong to the native language, official or common.

Its first official appearance, in 1842, was an introduction through foreign influence.

Origin of error

This showing cannot be integrated with Fornander's idea that it was adopted by the Hawaiians in the fourteenth century. I believe that Fornander was misled by the language of his environment.

In the last quarter century of the monarchy, we find *Ka Moi* and *Ka Moi Wahine* well established as terms for King, Queen, Sovereign, or Majesty. Today, in sight of the main street of Honolulu, King Lunalilo's mausoleum bears in large letters of gold, the following inscription:

LUNALILO
KA MOI
1874

All this belongs to the official circle within which Fornander moved during the time of his intensive studies.

Fornander's authorities

His principal Hawaiian historical authority was S. M. Kamakau (23) who served in the legislature many times between the years 1851 and 1876 (37, p. 44). I cannot find that

Kamakau makes the same statement concerning *moi* as does Fornander, but he uses the term loosely and irregularly. Pre-disposed to the magnificent and the spectacular, he frequently applied the term *moi* to the early Hawaiian kings, especially in his later writings. In the first few of his articles, however, he consistently used the term *alii*. He wrote continuously in the native newspapers between 1865 and 1871.

Another historical associate of Fornander was Kepelino, to whom is attributed a manuscript history of Hawaii written in 1868 (24). It gives as though ancient the order of the Hawaiian government as conducted after the death of Kamehameha I, and placed the *Mo-i* at the head. The term as explained by him was composed of two words, *mo*, a "container for words", and *i*, "to speak." "Therefore the king was called a *moi* because it was his to command." No Hawaiian authority, ancient or modern, will confirm this statement, nor the identification of the term *mo*; furthermore Hawaiians point out that it was not their nature to analyze terms in this manner.

Apparently Fornander was led astray through conclusions drawn from the prominence of the term *moi* in the modern official vocabulary, and the use made of it by Kamakau and Kepelino.

Early terms for "king"

In a search for terms in Hawaiian for "king" or "chief", it will be found that the first written record was that made at Kauai in 1778 by Cook (6, II, 216) who wrote "hairee", namely, *he alii*. Later, Lieut. King (6, III, 153) noted that rank was in three grades: "The first are the Erees, or Chiefs, of each district; one of them is superior to the rest, and is called at Owwhyhee Eree-taboo [*Alii-kapu*] and Eree Moe [*Alii kapu-moe*]. By the first of these words they express his absolute authority; and by the latter, that all are obliged to prostrate themselves (or put themselves to sleep, as the word [*moe*] signifies) in his presence." As King observed, Terreoboo or Kalaniopuu, then king of the island of Hawaii was such a chief.

The *moe* or prostration tabu had already been observed by Cook on Kauai, and King's explanation of the term "Eree Moe" makes it clear that the reference is to the *alii-kapu* class of chiefs with the *kapu-moe* privilege carrying the highest degree of

prescribed postural respect. It is unrelated to *moi*, or to *alii moi*, the modern descriptive title. With the *alii-kapu* is associated the phase which marks the ruler as "king by divine right", to be discussed later.

The terms for "king" appearing in the native writings* (cf. p. 3 above) are: *Ke Alii* (The Chief), *Ke Alii Nui* or *Ke Aliinui* (The High Chief), *Alii aimoku* (Chief possessing the island, or province), *Aliinui aimoku*, and *Alii ai aupuni* (Chief possessing the kingdom, or government). There are other variants or descriptive qualities attached to the term *alii* including the abbreviated form *'lii*. In poetry, and in respectful or affectionate address, the term *Lani* (Sky, Heaven) is found; occasionally, though rarely, it has the qualification *aimoku*, as used in the Lament of Kahahana: "He *lan*i *aimoku*, he *alii* no *ka moo*" (A reigning king, a sacred chief in the genealogical line).

For the designation of "the king" the qualifications are necessary. *Alii* and *Lani* are also applied to the numerous members of the chiefly caste, so that *Ke Alii* or *Ka Lani* might refer to a minor chief, a high chief, or the king. Standing without context, either term would indicate the king. The term *alii ai aupuni* is rare, and may be merely descriptive.

The "*alii aimoku*"

The earliest reference to *alii aimoku* in tradition might mark it as belonging to the period of Liloa (ca. 1525 A. D.): "He 'lii nui *aimoku* o Liloa no Hawaii a puni" (Liloa was the king of the whole of Hawaii Island). This application of the term is more descriptive than titular and the record (12, IV, 178-9) being recent, it is possible that the title originated later than the time of Liloa.

The qualification *ai-moku* is also descriptive. *Moku* is applied to "an island", "a land division", and other things. *Ai*, normally interpreted as "food" has the nuclear concept of "absorption". Hence, in the older dictionaries it is interpreted as a verb for

*Mr. R. S. Kuykendall has given me the following quotation from Kotzebue's Voyage (London, 1821, III, 245-6) in which Chamisso, naturalist of the expedition, notes the terms used in 1816 and 1817:

"The word *Hieri*, *jeri*, *erih*, *ariki*, or *hariki* (chief), is best to be translated by lord. The king is *Hieri ei Moku* [*Alii aimoku*], the Lord of the Island or Islands. Every powerful prince or chief is *Hieri Nue* [*Alii Nui*], Great Lord, and by this title *Tamaahmaah*, *Kareimoku*, *Haulhann* (Mr. Young), are called without distinction."

"eat" and "possess". In the latest dictionary the compound *aimoku* is translated as "to conquer."

With Malo the term *alii aimoku* is titular in the direct sense of ruler or administrator, applied not only to temporal but to spiritual matters—in brief, "the high executive." Malo uses it particularly when he mentions the king in discussing civil affairs of state.

The military side predominates in Hawaiian temporal power, and we find the *alii aimoku* to be also the warrior king. Malo (27, XXXVII, 122) notes that "If the king [*alii aimoku*] is killed in war, he is placed in the sacrificial temple [*luakini*] and offered up by the other king [*alii aimoku*]." The *luakini* class of temple may be used only by the king or independent chief (28, p. 212).

Malo (27, XXII, 4) also states that cloaks made of the *mamo* feather belonged to the *alii aimoku* as his war cloak. But one feather cloak of this type has been identified—that of Kamehameha I.

In the administration of spiritual matters, namely, the services at the national temples, it is found that the presence of the king or his deputy is essential, and during the most sacred service, the priest alone accompanies him. The priest utters the incantations, but the king merely moves his lips. When the priest has obtained favorable auguries, he begs the king for a piece of land.

It may be a matter of surprise to find that the king referred to is still the *alii aimoku* (or administrative phase) and not the *alii-kapu* or sacred phase. I shall give two quotations from Malo (27, XXXVIII, 23-4) to illustrate this: "Of all the kings [*alii aimoku*] from the ancient times to that of Kamehameha I, not a single king [*alii aimoku*] was irreligious." Malo further adds that "If any king [*alii aimoku*] were neglectful about worship, it was believed that the kingdom would pass to a king who was punctilious in worship." In brief, it is stated that the subjects were much gratified with a religious king, because they believed that his devotions brought prosperity to the land and success in war.

From the references given it is apparent that not only did the term *alii aimoku* apply to the king as the supreme administra-

tor in temporal and spiritual matters, but also that Kamehameha I and the kings preceding him were regarded by Malo as *alii aimoku*.

Malo, however, did not restrict the term to the rulers of the entire island, although it might be so inferred. Since Fornander states that *alii aimoku* indicated the "independent chiefs of provinces only", we may combine the two and arrive at the fact that the term was applied by Hawaiians to any independent chief or king. In brief, its English analogue is "king."

Supremacy of the king

According to Malo (28, p. 84), Ellis, and other authorities, the Hawaiian king was supreme. His word was law. Malo (28, p. 79), however, occasionally mentions that the king's tenancy was contingent upon good behavior—a reference undoubtedly to political revolution. As shown, he was not merely the temporal but also the spiritual administrator.

In addition, the king was the sole proprietor of the land by right of inheritance or conquest (9, p. 423). He granted the occupancy of it to his relatives, friends, and other chiefs, the grant being revocable at his will (28, p. 79), at his death (11, p. 300) and at the death of the occupant (9, p. 429). A complete redistribution was thus to be expected at the death of every king. With the occupancy went an administration of the land which was independent, except for the king's requirements.

Land re-distribution, as a custom, did not necessarily imply that a family of chiefs might not become established in one district. Through friendship, intermarriage, or expediency perhaps, but with the king's acquiescence (cf. 9, p. 429), such occupancy has been noted as continuing for several generations. Opportunity was thus afforded for building up a military or political organization stronger than that of the king's immediate group, followed at times by rebellion and independence or even usurpation of the throne.

In land matters, conquest wiped out all preceding titles in favor of the victors, who divided the new possessions among their followers (9, p. 423). It was also the custom, as Malo observed, for the victorious king to kill the defeated king, when captured, and offer up the body in sacrifice. The relentless search for the royal fugitive sometimes continued for as much as

two years after all fighting had ceased (11, pp. 201, 225, 348). In general, the defeated king died in the decisive battle. When it is noted by Malo (27, XXXVI, 8) that "Land was the principal thing sought by the kings through worship [*hoomana*]" and the significance of the term *alii aimoku* is given due consideration* it is evident that the pursuit and sacrifice of the defeated king was not so much for revenge as for the absorption of his title to the land. Such a conclusion seems more certain when the victim is frequently found to be a brother or near relative.

Of course under the system followed, land and power are inseparable, but it is possible that the system was not very ancient.

Land system not ancient

If we may read history in the legends Fornander followed, the conquest of Hawaii Island by Hua of Maui about 1100 A. D. did not affect land titles (11, p. 41). About 1400, Kalaunuiohualoa of Hawaii conquered the islands of Maui and Molokai and part of Oahu and captured their kings. He was defeated and captured on Kauai (11, p. 67). No land was held or partitioned by the victors, and no kings were killed. No other clear-cut conquests followed until the last half of the eighteenth century (11, p. 147) when Kalaniopu'u of Hawaii seized part of Maui, distributing the land among his followers, and using it as a base for the attempted conquest of the whole island.

The earliest reference to the sacrifice of a king is also the first reference to land distribution. Two generations later, land-distribution on the king's death is noted as a custom. Throughout there was much internal strife and general departure from precedent. About 1550 the low-born Umi, with the aid of some priests, surprised, assassinated, and succeeded his half-brother, the rightful and high-born king (11, p. 78). The allegiance of some of the district chiefs was withheld from Umi, perhaps on account of his inferior birth, but they were conquered and their lands given to others (23). There was further rebellion and reconquest of the district chiefs in the reigns of Umi's son Keawenui and of Umi's grandson. Since land redistribution as a royal mortuary custom is said to have begun after the reign of Keawenui (11, p. 300), it seems highly probable that it arose

*cf. p. 11-13 above.

as a result of successive conquests, and with it the absolute power and all-embracing possessions of the king.

This later period appears to be distinctly un-Polynesian. For instance, land titles were hereditary within the tribe in New Zealand, or within the village community in Samoa, or within the upper and lower chiefly families in Tahiti. Conquest might, but did not necessarily make a change in these titles. The title *alii aimoku* is limited to the Hawaiian Islands, while the absolute power ascribed to the Hawaiian kings is greater than that of the southern Polynesians. At the same time, there is enough to be observed in the earlier and later Hawaiian periods to indicate that its system of aristocracy was basically connected with that of the Society Islands.

Prescriptive rights

Fornander correctly sensed the fact that there was some "constitutional or prescriptive right" by which the Hawaiian king theoretically could or did keep in control the provincial chiefs of greater power or wealth than himself. This right does not appear in our examination of the *alii aimoku*-ship which, apparently, was the might of the mailed fist. If we look closely, we find that the functions of the king as *alii aimoku*, whether in temporal or spiritual matters, are entirely active. Circumstances may arise which will lead to his displacement if he becomes lax.

The "right" detected by Fornander, but incorrectly applied, was the passive one present in the king as *alii-kapu* or tabu chief whose power existed through his identification with the great gods—through the right of inherited divinity.

In this part of the study we are handicapped through the acquired condemnatory outlook of our principal informant, David Malo, whose judgment, as his translator (28, pp. 6-7) points out, became warped through his new ideas on religion. Malo rejected the fascinating series of Maui myths because he would "repeat no lies" (28, p. 322). He, perhaps, was the authority for revealing the royal Hawaiian genealogy, which is treated as though all the ancestors were human beings. Since the other Polynesian genealogies are cosmogonies in their earlier stages, and the names and actions of the characters, similarly placed in the Hawaiian genealogies, agree with those of the cosmogonic characters in the other genealogies (36, p. 13), we must read

Hawaii through the rest of Polynesia. This is necessitated through the fact that in Hawaii as in other parts of Polynesia (36, pp. 5-6) the genealogies were sacred and secret, and although the significance of the sacred portions has been, under changed conditions, revealed elsewhere, it was not done in Hawaii. The attitude towards the old in Hawaii which Malo and his instructors displayed was such that no keeper of the sacred genealogies could acquaint them with all the accepted details. We must therefore derive the Hawaiian kings from the ancient gods, the record of which is the royal genealogy, preserved, as Malo (28, p. 81) points out, with the greatest care. In Malo's idea (28, p. 87), also, failure to maintain a genealogy might lower an *alii* to the status of a commoner, since apparently it was only the genealogy which established the *alii*-ship.

Whether gods or *alii* or commoners, they seem to depend upon *mana*.

Mana

Mana is described in the dictionaries as "might", "supernatural power", "divine power of God", "spirit", "energy of character", etc. all of which are variably applicable. *Mana* is ever present, and in all objects animate and inanimate. If we are content to regard it as analagous to the power of God, the supreme source, as in the Christian concept, further definition is unnecessary. Otherwise we may draw an analogy with electricity, a vast but indescribable fund of latent power and energy, which may be motivated by various agencies, including human, and, what is more important to observe, may be drawn on and directed by human effort. *Mana* however may vary in quality, or, more likely in force, according to the degree of its concentration.

Under the influence of great *mana*, man becomes superhuman, with a capacity for accomplishment limited only by his *mana*. Without *mana*, he is but a clod, or a shell. However, the shells vary in quality. That of the commoner is of low grade, because his genealogy is not established. The shell of the chief must be of high potentiality because it is identified through the genealogy with that of the gods.

Hoomana

The terms *hoomana* and *haipule* have been generally translated

as "worship." Other interpretations of *hoomana* are: "to ascribe divine honors", "to cause one to have regal power." In the term, we may recognize *mana* with the causative *hoo*. *Hoomana* is accomplished through *haipule*, meaning "recitation of *pule* or prayers", the "prayers" being found upon examination to be less supplications than magical incantations, sequences of names and allusions as though the spoken word drew out the *mana* and directed it in the stream of the incantation.

Without *hoomana*, apparently, none of the Hawaiian gods now heard of, whether great or small, could exist. This is a clear indication of their shell phase mentioned, because the power to motivate them must be drawn from outside. The regularity of *hoomana*, which Malo states was required for the great gods, again brings up the analogy of electricity. The shell represents the storage battery, which on account of losses of power through usage and possible leakage, must be consistently recharged. The analogy is weak in the penalty phase for neglect of *hoomana*. In case of neglect, the god, although fading away, is supposed to inflict severe punishment (cf. 10, p. 24 and 9, p. 112). The analogy however is maintained if part of the *hoomana* be regarded as insulation upkeep.

Creating gods

If *hoomana* be essential to the maintenance or support of a god, why cannot a god be created by the same process? Malo (28, p. 142) states that this was done, both with the king's bones and with those of commoners. The king's bones alone were given very special treatment that they might become an *akua maoli* (real god). It was the type of god termed *akua aumakua*, and a temple was made for it.

Malo gives few details concerning the creation of gods by men. Since he regards *aumakua* and *unihipili* as similar, we may understand the process from J. S. Emerson's account of the *unihipili* (10, p. 4). The essential materials are the bones and hair of a near relative or friend. Over these, regular daily *hoomana* must be rigidly maintained until the spirit of the *unihipili* is strong and operative. It then becomes the friend and servant of its creator, and imbues him with superhuman power. If the *hoomana* be neglected, however, the *unihipili* spirit destroys

him. The term *aumakua* in general indicates a "steady, trustworthy servant."

The connection of the devotee or creator with the *unihipili* may be established through the relationship, or through the possession of the remains, or both, while the connection with the *unihipili* spirit enables the creator to reach into the vast fund of *mana* beyond.

Andrews defines *akua-aumakua* as "the ancestors of those who died long ago, and who have become gods; the spirits of former heroes." N. B. Emerson (28, p. 144) states that the great gods of Hawaii, namely, Ku, Kane, Kanaloa, and Lono, were spoken of as *akua maoli*, and also affirms (28, p. 157) that they were *aumakua*. J. S. Emerson (10, p. 16) states that these gods were "sometimes regarded as *aumakua*, particularly by the highest chiefs." It might then seem that these great gods are but the royal ancestors projected into the past and magnified through the accumulations of *mana*. In Maori sacred tradition (34), Tane (Hawaiian Kane) as the great procreator and aided by the enchantments of his brother gods, becomes the biological human ancestor. His personification is Tiki, or Ki'i as carried in the Hawaiian genealogies. The circle might thus seem to have been completed. However, I do not feel too sure of the analogies since they may be drawn from more than one religious or philosophical system.

Identity of kings and gods

Whether the great gods are concepts or projections, *hoo mana* is essential for their maintenance, so that the country as well as the king may be benefitted and not injured. The benefits, apparently, are to be obtained through the establishment of the identity of the *alii-kapu* element with the great gods, which is done by means of the carefully preserved genealogies intended to prove the purity of the *alii's* descent (28, p. 81).

This identification with the great gods by means of the genealogy might seem to have been the principle of Hawaiian temple worship, or the core around which the services centered.

As in the English term "lineage" and as used by the Maoris, the Hawaiians apparently symbolized the genealogy as a line or cord. *Aha* in Hawaiian is a braid composed of the fibers of the coconut husk—short compared with other fibers used, but

in successive combinations making a continuous product. Such, of course, is also the genealogy.

Aha were also the important temple incantations, the name of which Andrews says originated from the analogy of the coconut fiber braid. *Aha* was also the acquiescence of the god indicating that the incantation was successful; unless "the *aha* were obtained" (*loaa ka aha*) all the many preceding services were without avail.

According to Malo (27, XXXVII, 95) the decisive service of the temple consecration was the *hoowilimoo*. Emerson (28, p. 245) records an incantation for the service addressed to Kane, in which the theme is the devotional offering of the sacred red braid *Hoowilimoo* (*ka alana o ka aha ula Hoowilimoo*) and the acceptable conclusion of the incantation. The service itself was held over a coconut fiber braid in the sacred Mana house of the temple. Emerson translates *hoowilimoo* as "twisting the *moo*" or lizard, although *moo* is an orthodox abbreviation of *mookuahau*, "genealogy", (4) as may now be recognized. Evidently we have here a claim preferred by the priest of the king (who himself does not offer incantations) of the identity of the god and the king by means of the genealogy. Hence (28, p. 226) the priest's assurance of success to the king when the god's acquiescence is obtained. Similarly with the other *aha* services—the acquiescence of the god symbolized an acknowledged identity by means of the connecting cord or genealogy.

The identity being established, then the *mana* present in, or instilled into the gods is also the *mana* of the *alii-kapu*, and thus becomes operative for the benefit of the country.

Perpetuation ceremony

Of course, if intended for such a mighty purpose, the quality of the shell must be in accord. Such was in mind in the *hoomau* (perpetuation) ceremony which Malo (27, XXV, 1-2) states was *hoomana* because it was believed that the kings were like gods in power (*mana*) and that "the begetting of children by members of royalty through the *hoomau* was worshipping the gods [*hoomana i ke akua*]. It was only practiced for the first-born, because the first-born was believed to be [inherently] a chief of the very highest rank or sanctity." Malo (27, XVIII, 15) also notes that these firstlings were especially high-born so that they might

occupy the throne, the *alii*-quality being increased through incestuous unions. The idea is present (certainly in modern times) that through such unions the rank or sanctity of the offspring was raised above that of either of the parents.

There were several degrees of *alii-kapu*, but the highest resulted from the union of full brother and sister in the direct royal line. The offspring of such "was called a god" (*ua kapaia ke akua*), with a sanctity requiring the prostration of the people. The intended parents, not allowed to form a first union with a low chief or a commoner, were mated for the day, the nuptials being under the aura of an ancestral god, while the priest chanted incantations for fertility from the union. These preparations apparently were sufficient to produce only a shell of an *alii*, for when the child was born, he had to submit to an "incantation to sanctify the chief" (*pule hoolaa alii*). The example preserved (22) forms a genealogical chain from chaos thundering down untold ages and world phases, through gods and human beings, to the princeling babe (36, p. 12). Thus even though the shell be of the highest quality, the *alii*-ship is not present until placed there through the incantation of the full genealogy, which affirms the *alii*'s god-ship.

Respect for rights

The preceding sketch will, I believe, explain any prescriptive right of a politically weak king to hold a stronger vassal in check. It is less a matter of rights, perhaps, than a recognition in common that the *mana* of the vassal (a near relative) reached him through the *alii*-ship of the king—the direct divine heir.

Notwithstanding the alleged right, rebellions, *with the support of the priests*, by elder brothers of less tabu or by younger brothers, did result in placing the fraternal relative on the altar. Malo's wording* is of interest here because he states that it was the *alii aimoku* who was sacrificed. Presumably the *alii-kapu* being divine, could not die. His spirit not being individualized was still operative, being also incarnated in younger *alii-kapu*. This obviously was recognized by the powerful usurper, who is to be observed in history as taking the *alii-kapu* into his possession as soon as possible. If the *alii-kapu* be a woman, she is either married to the usurper, or to his son, and the direct line is thus

* p. 12 above.

continued. The *alii-kapu* and *alii aimoku* are thus again united in the one person. Meanwhile, since proxy is common in Hawaiian worship, the *alii aimoku* will represent the *alii-kapu* in his control.

The Hawaiian system seems to be a primitive form of that evolved in Japan and in Tonga.

Customs not ancient

The customs discussed above do not seem to be very ancient in the Hawaiian Islands. In tradition, the prostration tabu dates from 1650 or 1700 (11, p. 277). While the cosmogonic incest myth is found in Hawaii, the first incestuous union which seems to have historical standing is that of Umi with his highly born sister (ca. 1550 A. D.). Umi was the first to introduce plebeian blood into the sacred line, and his marriage was intended to elevate his descendants. Following Umi, inbreeding seems to have grown and, under the theory of increasing the sanctity, must have been intended to reconcentrate the essence of divinity scattered through contact with Umi's partly plebeian ancestry. Probably the term and institution of *alii aimoku* belongs to the same period. Apparent innovations in the traditional period are listed in Table II, with assumed dates.

The term *alii aimoku* later disappeared through non-use. When Kamehameha I conquered or acquired the whole group, the designation was no longer necessary. Soon after this, *alii aimoku* is found applied to district governors under Kamehameha, later being displaced by the present term *kiaaina*, "governor."

Thus so far as Hawaiian royalty is concerned, a completeness and self-contained symmetry of organization and terminology has been shown. Despite the convenience of the brief term *moi*, the old Hawaiians were unaware of it as a term for "king."

"Moi", an idol

Andrews (3) gives as a third definition of the term *moi*: "name of one of the idols in the *luakini* [national temple]." The authority for this was apparently Malo (28, p. 228) in his account of the building of the highest grade of temple. He speaks of the *moi* as the "lord of the idols."

Unfortunately we cannot now obtain the pronunciation of the term *moi* for "idol." According to Mrs. Lahilahi Webb (38),

the Hawaiians had but two pronunciations for the word written "moi", namely, "mo'i" with the glottal stop, and "moi" with the vowels approaching the diphthong. Although similarly written, the words are very distinct in Hawaiian. Mrs. Webb was inclined to believe that, if it existed, the term for the idol was *mo'i*. *Mo'i* was the name of a very early, or a mythical priest.

The position of Malo's *moi* idol in the war or national temple corresponds with that of Ku, as observed by Cook's officers in 1779. This Ku, the war god, Malo stated was the most important god of the temple he was then describing. When the image intended to represent Ku is met with, Malo merely calls it *he moi* "a *moi*", although Ku was the dominant national god in Malo's youth.

One explanation is that Malo, writing in 1840, or his informant, might have borrowed the term *moi* as indicating "supreme" from the missionary translations of 1832, or from the missionary Richards, his very close friend.

Possible derivations

If *moi* were an esoteric term for the supreme god, it may not have reached the people. Accepting for the moment Mrs. Webb's pronunciation "mo'i", it may have been caught up by the missionary translators with the guttural break emphasized, as a synonym for "supreme" or "majesty." The over-emphasis of the guttural break may have caused the perpetuation of the unusual pronunciation "mo-i" (moh-ee).

Starting again from the basis that the *moi* was the central image of the row of images, "the lord of the idols," and represented Ku the war god and spirit of the temple, we may find several possible derivations. From the Polynesian, only two suggest themselves. In Samoa (31), there is *mo'i*, "true, to be true." Closer perhaps are the Tahitian terms (7): *moi*, "the heart of a tree," and *moi-moi*, "aged, principal, steady old man."

In another direction we find (33) the Japanese word *moi* (with the long "o") "fury" which may be regarded as symbolic of war. The Japanese pronunciation of the Ainu term for "god" or "supreme" is *kamoi*, according to Professor Harada (15), who also points out that the Japanese term *kami* indicates god, master, head of the government or of the family. Philologically, the

comparisons are irregular, and the solution of the enigma of derivation is not yet at hand.

For conclusions I may refer back to those outlined in the introduction, in substantiation of which the present discussions are offered.

TABLE I

*Appearance of the term "moi"
in some translations of the Scriptures into Hawaiian*

Year	Translator	Wording	Reference
1832	Bingham	"The blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords." O ka Moi pomaikai hookahi, o ke Alii o na alii, o ka Haku o na haku.	I Timothy, VI, 15
	Rowell	O ka mea mana pomaikai . . .	
1832	Bingham	". . . principalities and powers . . ." . . . na moi a me na'lii . . .	Titus, III, 1
	Rowell	. . . na alii ana a me na mana . . .	
1832	Bingham	". . . on the right hand of the Majesty on high." . . . ma ka lima akau o ka Moi maluna lilo.	Hebrews, I, 3
	Rowell	. . . ma ka lima akau o ka ihiihi ma na wahi kiekie.	
1832	Bingham	". . . a scepter of righteousness is the scepter of thy kingdom." . . . he hoailonamoi o ka pono ka hoailonamoi o kou aupuni.	Hebrews, I, 8
	Rowell	. . . he laaumoi o ka pono . . .	
1832	Bingham	". . . the throne of the Majesty in the heavens." . . . ka nohoalii o ka Moi ma ka lani.	Hebrews, VIII, 1
	Rowell	. . . ka nohoalii o ka ihiihi ma na lani.	
1832	Richards	". . . whether it be to the king, as supreme." . . . ina ma ka ke alii nui e like ia me he Moi la.	I Peter, II, 13
	Rowell	. . . ina he alii me he poo kela'ku.	
1831-9	Bingham	"O Lord my salvation." E kuu Moi kuu mea e ola'i	Psalms, XXXVIII, 22
1831-9	Bingham	"The scepter of thy kingdom is a right scepter." O ka hoailonamoi o kou aupuni, he hoailonamoi pono no ia.	Psalms, XLV, 6

TABLE II

First references in traditional period

Reference	Ruler	Assumed date	Comments
Alii aimoku	Liloa	1525	Probably later
Sacrifice of a king	Umi	1550	
Land distribution after conquest	Umi	1550	
Royal incest	Umi	1550	
Land redistribution after king's death	Lonoikamakahiki	1600	
Kapu-moe, prostration tabu	Kauai royalty	1675	

REFERENCES

1. Alexander, W. D. 1891. Brief history of the Hawaiian people. New York.
2. Andrews, L. 1836. Hawaiian vocabulary. Lahainaluna.
3. Andrews, L. 1865. Hawaiian dictionary. Honolulu.
4. Andrews, L. 1922. Hawaiian dictionary, revised by H. H. Parker. Honolulu.
5. Bingham, H. Hawaiian vocabulary; MS dated 1832.
6. Cook, J. and King, J. 1784. Voyage to the Pacific Ocean, 3 vols. London.
7. Davis, J. 1851. Tahitian and English dictionary. Tahiti.
8. [Dibble, S.] 1838. Mooololo Hawaii. Lahainaluna.
9. Ellis, W. 1828. Narrative of a tour through Hawaii. London.
10. Emerson, J. S. 1892. The lesser Hawaiian gods (Paper No. 2, H. Hist. Soc.)
11. Fornander, A. 1880. The Polynesian Race, Vol. II. London.
12. Fornander MSS. 1916-1919. Mem. Bishop Museum, Vols. IV-VI.
13. Foreign Office and Executive Files, 1833 to 1843. Archives of Hawaii, including 13 a-c.
- 13a. MS. translation of letter, Sept. 1, 1842, from S. Mallet, Commander of French ship l'Embuscade. (In the handwriting of Dr. G. P. Judd).
- 13b. Official correspondence relating to the late Provisional cession of the Sandwich Islands (Published by Authority.) G. P. Judd, translator. Printed between Feb. 25 and March 3, 1843.
- 13c. Documents relating to the Restoration of the Sandwich Islands flag. G. P. Judd, translator. Printed on July 31, 1843, or soon after.
14. Green, J. S. 1841. Church history (in Hawaiian). Lahainaluna.

15. Harada, Tasuku. Professor of Japanese history in University of Hawaii.
16. Hawaii, 1841. Constitution and laws (in Hawaiian). Honolulu.
- 16a. Translation of the Constitution and Laws . . . of Kamehameha III. 1842. Lahainaluna. [Wm. Richards, compiler and translator.]
17. Hawaii. MS proceedings of the legislative assembly 1841-1847 (in Hawaiian).
18. Hawaii, 1843. Laws passed at the annual council of the Hawaiian nobles and representatives at Lahaina, April, 1843 (in Hawaiian).
19. Hawaii, 1843. Laws passed by the legislature in Honolulu, Aug. 11, 1843 (in Hawaiian).
20. Hawaii, 1846-1868. (Hawaiian editions of the laws passed by the various legislatures—printed in Honolulu).
21. Jarves, J. J. 1847. History of the Hawaiian Islands. Honolulu.
22. [Kalakaua] 1889. Ke Kumulipo no Ka-I-imamao. Honolulu.
23. Kamakau, S. M. 1865-1871. Articles in Ka Nupepa Kuo-koa and Ke Au Okoa, Hawaiian newspapers published in Honolulu.
- 23a. Ka Nonanona, 1842. Honolulu.
24. Kepelino. MS entitled Mooolelo Hawaii, written in 1868.
25. Kuykendall, R. S. 1926. A history of Hawaii. New York.
26. Lee, W. L. 1850. Penal code (in Hawaiian). Honolulu.
27. Malo, David. MS entitled Mooolelo Hawaii, written about 1840 (in Hawaiian).
28. Malo, David. 1903. Translation of No. 27 by N. B. Emerson, entitled "Hawaiian antiquities." Honolulu.
29. Pokuea, J. F. 1858. Mooolelo Hawaii. Honolulu.
30. Polynesian, The. February 1, 1845. Honolulu.
31. Pratt, G. 1878. A grammar and dictionary of the Samoan language. London.
32. Rowell, G. B. MS revision of Hawaiian translation of the New Testament.

33. Saito, H. 1928. Japanese-English dictionary. Tokyo.
34. Smith, S. P. 1913. Lore of the whare wananga (Mem. 3, Polynesian Soc.).
35. Stokes, J. F. G. 1909. Index to Fornander's "Polynesian Race." Honolulu.
36. Stokes, J. F. G. 1930. Evaluation of early genealogies (Vol. 39, No. 1 Jnl. Polynesian Soc.).
37. Thrum, T. G. 1918. Life of Kamakau. (26th Rep. H. Hist. Soc.).
38. Webb, Mrs. E. Lahilahi. Guide to exhibits, Bishop Museum.

